

REMARKS

In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended the specification in order to correct for a minor typographical error.

In the Office Action of January 21, 2004, claims 1, 5, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McNeil (U.S. Patent No. 4,919,351).

Claims 2-4, 6-12, and 15-23 were allowed in the Office Action of January 21, 2004.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the allowability of claims 1, 5, 13 and 14 in the present application. The present Amendment is presented to place the application in condition for allowance, or alternatively in a better form for Appeal in accordance MPEP § 706.07(e). Applicants submit that the present Amendment raises no new issues in the case and merely further clarifies the previous Amendment and arguments.

The Examiner exerts that claim 1 still reads on the structure of McNeil because the flat surface 43 is still part of the "circumferential surface" of the roll 23. The "circumferential surface" of claim 1 is the radius-circle portion of the roll, as explained in detail in the last amendment. McNeil expressly describes that its blades 32 do not extend beyond the radius-circle portion of the roll. So that there can be no confusion on this issue, claim 1 is amended to expressly call for the first and second blades to extend beyond the radius circular circumference surface of the chopper roll. Also, claim 1 now calls for the second blade tip segment to be more resilient than the first blade. This claimed relative degree of resiliency is not present in the blades of McNeil '531.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 now positively defines over McNeil.

Respectfully, McNeil does not disclose a web cut-off assembly wherein the chopper roll blades extend beyond the radius circular circumference surface of the chopper roll.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 defines over McNeil and is in condition for allowance. Further, all claims that depend from claim 1 (claims 5 and 13) are also in condition for allowance. Their rejections being made moot due to the allowance of claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 14 in a manner similar to that of claim 1, and respectfully submit that claim 14 defines over McNeil and is in condition for allowance for essentially the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

With the present Amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at his convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

By: Neal P. Pierotti
Neal P. Pierotti
Registration No.: 45,716

P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
fax (864) 233-7342